

the reply is there. But the question asked was very comprehensive and so we wanted to furnish as much portion of the information as is readily available. As soon as the full information is collected we will place it on the Table and if Hon'ble Members want to put supplementaries on that we have no objection to take up the question later on. I only pleaded our inability to furnish full information within the time prescribed as the time available was short.

Agreement between Madras and Mysore regarding sharing of water of Cauvery River.

*Q.—360. Sri M. K. BOMME GOWDA (Krishnarajapet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the terms of agreement between the Governments of Madras and Mysore regarding the sharing of waters of Cauvery;

(b) whether the Government of Madras has acted according to the agreement?

A.—Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—

(a) Copy of the general agreement of 1892 between the Governments of Madras and Mysore classifying Cauvery as a schedule River, and copy of the 1924 Agreement between the two Governments relating to the scope of development of Projects and extension of Irrigation in the two States are placed on the Table of the House. [Placed in the Legislature Library vide No. 9/L. A.—1959 (Budget)].

(b) Certain projects have been taken up by the Government of Madras which are considered to be outside the scope of the above-mentioned agreements. The matter is under correspondence.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಕೆ. ಬೊಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.—ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಡಂಬಡಿಕೆಗೆ ಹೊರಗಾದವುಗಳೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೊರಗಾದವುಗಳು ಯಾವುವು ?

L.A.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಒಡಂಬಡಿಕೆಗೆ ಹೊರಗಾದವುಗಳೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು—

(a) Development of irrigation under Mettur Canals Scheme to irrigate about 18,000 acres in Coimbatore district and 27,000 acres in Salem district.

(b) Remodelling of Kattalai Bed regulator about 40 miles upstream of grand anicut.

(c) Pullambadi channel from the left bank of the upper anicut.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಕೆ. ಬೊಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.—ಅಪ್ಪರ್ ಕಾವೇರಿ ರೀಜನ್ನು ಎಂದರೆ ಕನ್ನಂದಾಡಿ ಕಟ್ಟೆಯ ಮೇಲು ಭಾಗದ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊರಗಾದವು ಯಾವುವೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಮದರಾಸು ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಬರಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಅಗ್ರಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಅವಧಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸಗಳಿವೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಎಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಐವತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದ ನಂತರ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಂದು ವಿಧಾಯಕ ವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಮದರಾಸು ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆಯನ್ನು ನೂಟಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಯಾವಾಗ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಗೊತ್ತಾದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ದಲ್ಲೇ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

Sri C. K. RAJAI AH SETTY.—After State Reorganisation, since Coorg has joined Mysore, the length of Cauvery river in Mysore has increased and it has not increased in Madras. So is it not necessary that the rules should be revised.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Government is examining all aspects of the question resulting from the formation of the new State.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Is it not a fact that this agreement has adversely affected Mysore and that the Mysore Government has not taken advantage of the terms of the agreement, and if the answer to these is in the affirmative, how is it that Government has slept over this matter so far ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—At the time of the 1892 Agreement there was no definite agreement in regard to sharing of water of the Cauvery. It prescribes only the regions within which new projects will have to be constructed and also the terms and conditions under which the new projects will have to be constructed both in Mysore and in Madras. At the time when the 1924 agreement was entered into between Mysore and Madras, we wanted to construct the present Krishnarajasagar. I do admit that the Agreement of 1892 and the subsequent Agreement of 1924 viewed from the present set-up of development, are really a handicap to Mysore.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Before any new projects are taken up by the Madras Government, is it not binding under the Agreements on the Madras Government to obtain the concurrence or at least consult the Mysore Government?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—In all fairness it should be done.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Has that fairness been adhered to by the Madras Government?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—As I have already said, some projects which can be deemed to be outside the Agreements have been constructed.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—What is the result of the protest made by Mysore Government?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The result of our protest has not so far been very fruitful. All the same, the Government has been continuing its efforts to bring home to the Government of Madras the adverse effect of their new constructions, on Mysore.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.—1974 ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಅಚ್ಚುಕಟ್ಟು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—As per the Agreement, the Mysore Government can develop to the extent of Rs. 1,10,000 acres in the Cauvery valley subject to the limitations which have been placed by the Agreement.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—May I know whether the matter is still in correspondence with the Government of Madras or the Central Government?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The unfortunate part of it is that the Planning Commission has permitted the execution of these three projects in spite of our protests. We have now approached the Government of India and apprised them of the position. We have even gone to the extent of suggesting that a Tribunal may be appointed to go into the question.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The answer given by the Minister is not clear. Is it that our protest has not been heard by the Madras Government or is it that our protest is not effectual or what is the ultimate remedy open to us?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The ultimate remedy is, we have to refer this to a Tribunal for an award; we have to request the Government of India to appoint a tribunal to go into the question and give us an award.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಅಗ್ನಿಮೆಂಟ್ ನಿಂದ ಬೇಸಿಗೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ನಾರಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿರುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಅಗ್ನಿಮೆಂಟ್ ದೆಶೆಯಿಂದ ಅಗಿದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಅಗಿದೆಯೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಸಫಲವಾಗದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ನೀರು retaliate ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಸಫಲವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಯಾವಾಗ? ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯುನಲ್ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಈಗ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಅಹವಾಲನ್ನು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದರೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಾಹಸಿನ ಭಾಗವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅವರಿಂದ ನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿದೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—What are the projects that the Madras Government have taken, which are considered to be in violation of the Agreement?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have already answered that. Anyway for the information of the Hon'ble Member, I shall repeat it.

“Development of irrigation under Mettur Canals scheme to irrigate about 18,000 acres in

Coimbatore District and 27,000 acres in Salem District.

"Re-modelling of Kattalaj had regulator about 40 miles upstream of grand anicut.

"The drawing of Pullambadi Channel from the left bank of the Upper Anicut.

"All the three are expected to bring an additional extent of 70,000 acres under irrigation in the Madras territory."

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know the years in which these projects were taken up?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—For the first time there was a Press note in 'Deccan Herald' indicating that the Madras Government proposed to take these projects and it was in the year 1954. Immediately we got the information we corresponded with the Madras Government and told them that this was not in keeping with the terms and conditions of the agreement entered into by us and where the interpretation of the Madras Government has been different from our interpretation with regard to the terms and conditions of the agreement, the matter has been referred to the Planning Commission by the Government of Madras and as I already submitted, the unfortunate aspect of it is that the Planning Commission has included them in the Plan and approved them without reference to us.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Is it not a fact that an Inter-State River Valley Dispute Board ought to have been constituted and that the Planning Commission was not the proper authority to settle the dispute?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The Planning Commission has done their portion of the work. Their job is to provide funds for them and include them and give direction for their execution. It is open to the Government of Mysore to seek such relief as may be permissible under the law and under the agreement.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is there a scope for you to obtain a stay

order and if in the meantime the Government of Madras completes the projects what relief is given to us?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Government are taking all steps that are necessary. We have requested the Government to appoint a Tribunal in order to go into the question and that is what is provided for under the Agreement and we have been moving the Government in all possible manner to see that relief is given.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If in the meantime the projects get complete and are given effect to, what is the Government of Mysore going to do; is it not necessary that the Government of Mysore should tell the Government of India that till such time as this matter is disposed of either by the independent Tribunal or by the Government of India in consultation with the Planning Commission, they should give directions that the execution of the projects should be held up?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is not as though the Hon'ble Member's suggestion is not under the consideration of Government. But we wanted to exhaust all other remedies before taking a remedy of the kind suggested by the Hon'ble Member.

Starting of low shaft furnaces in the State.

*Q.—410. Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they are aware that the Government of India through the National Metallurgical Laboratory has erected and started a Low Shaft Furnace at Jamshedpur for producing pig iron in very small units by using non-coking and, or non-metallurgical coals and lignite that is found in large quantities in the country;

(b) whether they intend to utilise the services of the pilot plant mentioned above to carry out tests with our